	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669	
2	City Attomey	
3	Chief Trial Deputy	
4	RONALD P. FLYNN, State Bar #184186	
5	Deputy City Attorneys	
	San Francisco, California 94102-5408	
6 7	Telephone: (415) 554-3908	
·	]	
8	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO	),
9	SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEDADAMENT	
10	JAMES CUNNINGHAM,	,
H	ELIZABETH MARON, AND RICHARD PATE	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13		
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
16	RAHINAH IBRAHIM, an individual,	Case No. C06-0545 WHA
17	Plaintiff,	<del>[PROPOSED]</del> ORDER AUTHORIZING
18	vs.	DISCOVERY OF CONFIDENTIAL CRIMINAL HISTORY
19	DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND	INFORMATION IN THE POSSESSION OF DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY
20	SECURITY et al.,	OF SAN FRANCISCO
21	Defendants.	[STIPULATED]
22		Date Action Filed: January 27, 2006 Trial Date: April 12, 2010
23		April 12, 2010
24		I
25		
26		
27		
28		
į	ORDER RE CRIMINAL HISTORY INFORMATION Ibrahim v. DHS, et al. – USDC No. C06-0545 WHA	

## STIPULATION

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) the parties have met and conferred and stipulate as follows:

- 1. Good cause exists for the Court to authorize the parties to this action to receive certain "state summary criminal history information," as defined in California Penal Code section 11105(a), in the possession of the City and County of San Francisco. Namely:
- 2. Plaintiff Rahinah Ibrahim contends, *inter alia*, that the San Francisco Defendants unlawfully scarched and seized her in violation of the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution. The San Francisco Defendants contend that their search and seizure of Ibrahim was lawful or that qualified immunity applies. During the subject incident, San Francisco police officers contend they received and considered certain state summary criminal history information in determining what actions to take regarding Ibrahim. This information, reflected in a document in the possession of the City and County of San Francisco, may be relevant to whether San Francisco Defendants' actions were lawful. It is therefore discoverable, and good cause exists for its discovery.
- 3. Section 11142 of the California Penal Code makes it a misdemeanor to disclose state summary criminal history information to a person who is not authorized to receive such information. However, under section 11140 of the California Penal Code, a court may authorize persons to receive such information. Because good cause exists for discovery of the state summary criminal history information received by San Francisco Defendants during the subject incident, the parties respectfully request that the Court authorize the parties to this action to obtain that information in discovery.
- 4. State summary criminal history information produced in this action should be treated as confidential information subject to the terms of the Stipulated Protective Order in this action.
- 5. The term "state summary criminal history information" as used herein is a statutorily defined term. Its use is not intended to suggest that Plaintiff Rahinah Ibrahim has engaged in any criminal activity.

	$\downarrow$
	1 IT IS SO STIPULATED.
2	Dated: Sept. 29, 2009 McMANIS FAULKNER
	61 1.7 DI
4	By: WHAT TV ELIZABETH PIPKIN, Esq.
2	Attorneys for Plaintiff
Ć	RAHINAH IBRAHIM
7	
8	
9	By: Xua V ugo
10	
11	Attorneys for Defendants U.S. INVESTIGATIONS SERVICES, INC.
13	and JOHN BONDANELLA  Dated: 50, 29, 2009 DENNIS J. HERRERA
13	Dated: 2009 DENNIS J. HERRERA City Attorney
15	Parch 1. Alica
16	By: PETER J. KEITH, Deputy City Attorney
17	Ronald P. Funn Attorneys for Defendants
18	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, JAMES CUNNINGHAM, ELIZABETH MARON,
19	AND RICHARD PATE
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	ORDER RE CRIMINAL HISTORY INFORMATION 3

## ORDER

Pursuant to stipulation, and good cause appearing, the Court orders as follows:

- 1. The parties to this action are authorized to receive state summary criminal history information that any of the San Francisco Defendants may have received during the incident that is the subject of this lawsuit.
- 2. Any state summary criminal history information produced by Defendant City and County of San Francisco shall be treated as confidential information subject to the terms of the Stipulated Protective Order in this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 1, 2009

